

1  
2  
3  
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
5 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
6

7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

2:09-CR-78 JCM (RJJ)

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 SAMUEL DAVIS and SHAWN RICE,

11 Defendants.  
12

13 **ORDER**

14 Presently before the court is the government's motion to dismiss the third-party petition of  
15 Charles and Victoria Tingler. (Doc. #203). Charles and Victoria Tingler ("the Tingles") did not  
16 file an opposition. The government then filed a notice of non-opposition. (Doc. #216).

17 On May 27, 2011, the Tingles filed a third-party claim for a portion of the seized funds in  
18 this case. (Doc. #194). The government moved to dismiss their complaint on October 27, 2011,  
19 arguing that the Tingles lacked standing to bring suit pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(n). (Doc. #203).

20 Under Nevada Local Rule 7-2(d), "the failure of an opposing party to file points and  
21 authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion."  
22 However, the court will not automatically grant every unopposed motion. In *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46  
23 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995), the Ninth Circuit held that the court had to weigh the following factors  
24 before dismissing the action: (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the  
25 court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice; (4) the public policy favoring disposition  
26 of cases of their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.

27 . . .  
28

1 The court finds that the *Ghazali* factors weigh in favor of dismissing the Tinglers' third-party  
2 petition. *See Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

3 Accordingly,

4 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that government's motion to  
5 dismiss the third-party petition of Charles and Victoria Tingler (doc. #203) be, and the same hereby  
6 is, GRANTED.

7 DATED January 6, 2012.

8  
9   
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE